

Quantum Ginzburg-Landau theory of doped Mott insulators

Qiang-Hua Wang

*National Laboratory of Solid State Microstructures,
Institute for Solid State Physics, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China*

We improve a previous theory of doped Mott insulators with duality between pairing and magnetism by a further duality transform. As the result we obtained a quantum Ginzburg-Landau theory describing the Cooper pair condensate and the dual of spin condensate. We address the superconductivity by doping a Mott insulator, which we call Mott superconductivity. Some fingerprints of such novelty in cuprates are the scaling between neutron resonance energy and superfluid density, and the induced *quantized* spin moment by vortices or Zn impurity (together with circulating charge super-current to be checked by experiments).

After more than a decade of intense experimental and theoretical studies on high- T_c superconductors, it is becoming clear that the superconducting state turns out to be more “normal” than the normal state in the sense that there are better-defined fermionic quasi-particles that can be partly understood in terms of d-wave Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer (BCS) theory subject to suitable modifications. For example, the concept of nodal quasiparticles in d-wave BCS theory seems to account for a handful of transport properties.[1] Recently it is even established by scanning tunneling microscopy (STM) that the response of the superconducting state to weak impurities is excellently described by a usual d-wave Bogoliubov-de Genn (BdG) theory,[2] with quasi-particle scattering interference (a signature of well-defined free quasiparticles). The pairing gap function fitted according to scattering interference idea[3] agrees unexpectedly with that from angle-resolved photo-emission spectrum [4] (which is a probe in the momentum space in contrast to the real space STM). The implications would be the superconducting state of high- T_c superconductors is “normal”. If this were the case, then what makes high- T_c superconducting state unique? The secret is of no secret in the sense the experimental facts are already existing. First, the effective charge carrier density is given by doped holes. Second, the superfluid density scales with the doped holes in the underdoped region instead of the electron density. Third, there is well-defined inelastic neutron scattering resonance around the magnetic vector $\mathbf{Q}_0 = (\pi, \pi)$ with incommensurability that scales with the hole density.[5] The resonance energy scales with the su-

perfluid density. While the doping-dominated superfluid density could be understood in one way or the other from re-normalized Landau-Fermi liquid theory [6] or gauge theory[7], the existence of a neutron resonance is unexpected, whose importance to seek a correct theory can never be over-estimated, just as the isotope effect in usual superconductors. The implication is twofold. The first is obvious: There is dynamic spin anti-ferromagnetic correlations. The second is more far-reaching. The resonance energy is related to the EM photon gap in a Meissner state via Anderson-Higgs Mechanism. This means that the condensate view spin excitations as if they were EM gauge fields! This turns out to be just the crazy idea in a recent theory of doped Mott insulators,[8] which predicts a topological mutual-duality between Cooper pair condensate and spin magnetic condensate. The task of this Letter is to show that the theory accounts for the above mentioned aspects of high- T_c superconductivity. We identify the fingerprints of such superconductors by a quantum Ginzburg-Landau theory of doped Mott insulators, Eq.(7).

Previously [8] we derived an exact “all-boson” representation of the electronic t-J model and identified the mean field saddle point of the theory. The gauge fluctuations beyond mean fields combined to slave particles were then integrated in the infrared limit exactly, leaving us with an effective low energy field theory of doped Mott insulators described by the lagrangian $L = L_c + L_m + L_{CS}$ as follows.[8]

First, L_c describes the charge condensate (CC) of the theory,

$$L_c = i\bar{\rho}_c(\phi_c^* \frac{\partial \tau}{i} \phi_c - 2A_0) + iA_0 + i\delta\rho_c(\phi_c^* \frac{\partial \tau}{i} \phi_c + 2a_0^h - 2A_0) + i\mathbf{j}_c \cdot (\phi_c^* \frac{\nabla}{i} \phi_c + 2\mathbf{a}^m - 2\mathbf{A}) + \frac{u_c}{2}\delta\rho_c^2 + \frac{1}{2K_c}\mathbf{j}_c^2, (1)$$

where ϕ_c is the uni-modulus phase factor of a spin-charge recombined Cooper pair, $\bar{\rho}_c = (1-x)/2$ and $\mathbf{j}_c$ are the Cooper pair density and spatial current, respectively, K_c is the effective zero-temperature superfluid density, and finally u_c is the effective local charge repulsion. At low doping it can be shown that $K_c \propto x$. We emphasize that A_0 in the first two terms of L_c simply reminds us that the effective charge density is $1 - 2\bar{\rho}_c = x$, but the Cooper pair density is $(1-x)/2$ (counting electrons) and response to EM field as $2e$ -carriers. This bears out the Mott physics automatically. The effect of gauge fields a_0^h and $\mathbf{a}^m$ will become clear below.

Second, L_m describes the spin magnetic condensate (MC) of the theory,

$$L_m = i\delta\rho_m(\phi_m^* \frac{\partial_\tau}{i} \phi_m - 2a_0^m) + \mathbf{j}_m \cdot (\phi_m^* \frac{\nabla}{i} \phi_m - 2\mathbf{a}^h) + \frac{u_m}{2}\delta\rho_m^2 + \frac{1}{2K_m}\mathbf{j}_m^2, \quad (2)$$

where $\delta\rho_m$, ϕ_m and $\mathbf{j}_m$ are the z-direction magnetization S^z , the uni-modulus phase factor of S^- and the spin current. The background magnetic ordering wave vector $\mathbf{Q} = (\pi, \pi)(1-x)$ on square lattices as in cuprates. The effect of gauge fields a_0^m and $\mathbf{a}^h$ will be clear below.

Third, L_{CS} is given by

$$L_{CS} = \frac{i}{\pi}a_0^h(\nabla \times \mathbf{a}^h)_z + \frac{i}{\pi}a_0^m(\nabla \times \mathbf{a}^m)_z. \quad (3)$$

In the above the subscript z means the z -component of the object. Let us observe that integration over a_0^h and a_0^m using the total action L enforces $\nabla \times \mathbf{a}^h = -2\pi\delta\rho_c\hat{z}$ and $\nabla \times \mathbf{a}^m = 2\pi\delta\rho_m\hat{z}$. The physical meaning is that Cooper pair condensate view localized S^z -moments as 2π -flux bundle, while the magnetic S^- condensate view a localized Cooper pair density fluctuation also as their 2π -flux bundles. (Note that locally $\delta\rho_m \leq 1/2$ and $\delta\rho_c \leq 1/2$ due to the microscopic no-double occupation constrain). Similar ideas appear in the literature but suffer from U(1) gauge symmetry breaking combined to slave particles.[9]

Except for the first two terms in L_c (which gives the average density of Cooper pairs and the charge carrier

density) the two condensates CC and MC are *mutually dual* to each other. This mutual-duality is the crucial part of the theory that makes a difference to the 1D counterpart in which spin-charge separation is complete. In any case, the theory is millions of miles away from a Landau-Fermi liquid.

At zero temperature, we can simplify the theory by applying the concept of a self-duality transform as follows.[10] The basic idea is, if a condensate, say MC is disordered, its vortices condense instead. Let us call the new condensate as M'C. MC and M'C are self-dual, and see the charges of each other as flux bundles. Since $(\delta\rho_m, \mathbf{j}_m)$ is a conserved 3-current due to the coupling to the phase mode ϕ_m , it can be represented by the field strength of a gauge field, say, $b = (b_0, \mathbf{b})$ as

$$F_\mu = \epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda}\partial_\nu b_\lambda, \quad (4)$$

$$\delta\rho_m = F_\tau/2\pi, \quad \mathbf{j}_m^{x,y} = \mathbf{F}_{x,y}/2\pi. \quad (5)$$

This gauge field is seen by M'C via self-duality, and by CC via mutual duality. These lines of reasoning suggests the following rewriting of the total Lagrangian as

$$L = iA_0 + i\bar{\rho}_c(\phi_c^* \frac{\partial_\tau}{i} \phi_c - 2A_0) + i\delta\rho_c(\phi_c^* \frac{\partial_\tau}{i} \phi_c - 2A_0 + 2b_0) + i\mathbf{j}_c \cdot (\phi_c^* \frac{\nabla}{i} \phi_c - 2\mathbf{A} + 2\mathbf{b}) + \frac{u_c}{2}\delta\rho_c^2 + \frac{1}{2K_c}\mathbf{j}_c^2 \\ + i\delta\rho_v(\phi_v^* \frac{\partial_\tau}{i} \phi_v - 2b_0) + i\mathbf{j}_v \cdot (\phi_v^* \frac{\nabla}{i} \phi_v - 2\mathbf{b}) + \frac{u_v}{2}\delta\rho_v^2 + \frac{1}{2K_v}\mathbf{j}_v^2 + \frac{u_m}{8\pi^2}F_\tau^2 + \frac{1}{8\pi^2K_m}(F_x^2 + F_y^2), \quad (6)$$

where ϕ_v is a uni-modulus phase factor describing the vortex condensate M'C and $j_v = (\delta\rho_v, \mathbf{j}_v)$ is the associated current, u_v is the vortex fugacity and K_v is the vortex condensate phase stiffness. The Maxwell term for the physical EM fields is implicit in the theory. A caution of gauge symmetry related to the EM gauge fields $(A_0, \mathbf{A})$ is in order. The Lagrangian density itself is not EM gauge invariant due to the isolated term iA_0 , but the total action $S = \int d^2x d\tau L$ is. The mutual-duality is now aptly described by the fact that both CC and M'C are coupled to the spin fluctuation gauge field b . As a result the Chern-Simons term L_{CS} can be dropped from now on. u_v and K_v may be determined microscopically (for example at the mean field level of the bosonized t-J model[8]), but their behavior follows from simple arguments. Suppose we freeze the pairing channel, the magnitude of K_v is related to the gap for spin excitations. This

gap is zero in ordered MC at low dopings. At higher doping levels, since the squeezed charges work as vortices to MC, they eventually disorder the MC to its self-dual M'C at a critical doping level. At even higher doping, M'C is established with increasing phase stiffness. These lines of reasoning suggests that the bare stiffness $K_v \sim K_c$. This is more than reasonable in view of the fact that CC and M'C fight against a common animal, the spin excitation b -fields, and can condense simultaneously to form a superconductor, for which we propose a new terminology, a Mott superconductor, to discriminate from the usual BCS superconductor. In any case, we just have to tune a finite number of parameters for a specific material, but the basic physics is captured by the theoretical framework.

The final form of the theory is obtained by integrating

out the auxiliary currents $(\delta\rho_c, \mathbf{j}_c)$ and $(\delta\rho_v, \mathbf{j}_v)$ as

$$L = iA_0 + i\bar{\rho}_c(\phi_c^* \frac{\partial \tau}{i} \phi_c - 2A_0) + \frac{1}{2u_c}(\phi_c^* \frac{\partial \tau}{i} \phi_c - 2A_0 + 2b_0)^2 + \frac{K_c}{2}(\phi_c^* \frac{\nabla}{i} \phi_c - 2\mathbf{A} + 2\mathbf{b})^2 \\ + \frac{1}{2u_v}(\phi_v^* \frac{\partial \tau}{i} \phi_v - 2b_0)^2 + \frac{K_v}{2}(\phi_v^* \frac{\nabla}{i} \phi_v - 2\mathbf{b})^2 + \frac{u_m}{8\pi^2}F_\tau^2 + \frac{1}{8\pi^2 K_m}(F_x^2 + F_y^2), \quad (7)$$

which is a quantum Ginzburg-Landau theory for doped Mott insulators describing the Cooper pair condensate and the dual of spin condensate. In applying to finite temperatures it is no longer valid to do self-duality transform. This is because entropy effect at finite temperatures requires a concise meaning of order/disorder. In a sense temperature breaks the self-duality symmetry. But there is no problem in applying the theory to finite temperatures by keeping the above form.

A few lines of discussion on mechanism of Mott superconductor is in order. In the literature it is hotly debated whether spin fluctuations are the gluing force of pairing. The answer from the present theory is NO. They do exist but act to compete with superconductivity in a topological fashion. We would claim that both pairing and magnetism are intrinsic properties of doped Mott insulators.

The theory in the above new format place a good framework to discuss the Mott superconductor. Some unique features of Mott-superconductivity are immediately clear from this theory as we now discuss.

1) The CC+M'C state is a simultaneous Meissner state to A -photons and b -photons. At zero energy they can only appear in vortices of the condensate. As such, the gauge flux $\int d^2x \nabla \times 2\mathbf{b} = 2\pi n$ is quantized, just as the flux quantization in usual superconductors. The most-likely case is each vortex carries $n = 1$ quantum of flux, and according to $\delta\rho_m = \nabla \times \mathbf{b}/2\pi$ this is a quantized spin-1/2 moment. This tendency was also observed in a bosonic resonant valence bond theory based on the phase string effect on bipartite lattices.[9] The length scale of the distribution of this moment is determined by the "London penetration depth"

$$\lambda_b = \sqrt{\frac{u_m}{4\pi^2(K_c + K_v)}}, \quad (8)$$

which has the same qualitative behavior as that of the EM London penetration depth $\lambda_L \sim 1/\sqrt{K_c}$, assuming $K_c \sim K_v$. Since the dual of M'C is MC, the vortex favors MC. In fact in the vortex core, the gap for dynamic b -fluctuations is lowered. Therefore, in addition to the quantized spin moment, we also expect a cloud of softened spin excitations on an incommensurate anti-ferromagnetic background (according to the starting point of the theory). *The quantized spin moment*

is a benchmark to compare with other theories [11] that also predict induced magnetism. This should also be a fingerprint of Mott superconductivity.

In the absence of applied magnetic field $\nabla \times \mathbf{A} = 0$, the vortex can be induced, for example, around Zn impurities in cuprates. This is because the Zn impurity works as an empty site to the system where unpaired spins have lower energy than elsewhere. (A Ni impurity does not upset spin pairing and is therefore a much weaker impurity than Zn.) The fact that Zn impurity captures spin moment has been observed by nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) measurements.[12] The next challenge to both our theory and experimentalists is to prove that there is also a charge super-current around Zn impurities, since the gauge flux of $\mathbf{b}$ is also seen by CC. In some sense this is indirectly proved by the strong suppression of Zn impurity to superconductivity, in a Swiss-cheese fashion[12] as if each Zn kills a super-conducting region of the order of $\pi\xi^2$, the area of a vortex core.

On the other hand, under an applied magnetic field, two possibilities follows. If the vortex core energy in M'C is lower than that in CC, then a quantized spin moment is induced in the CC-vortex to counteract the applied flux. This lowers the kinetic energy cost in CC, making the CC-vortex non-topological (with zero winding number), with the expense of causing a vortex in M'C. This is a way of making cheap vortices as realized in another context [13] (but without the topological structure in M'C). Moreover, the softened spin fluctuations will be reflected in inelastic neutron scattering, with the scattering strength scaling with the number of vortices. This is exactly what was observed in cuprates. [14] Another possibility is that the M'C-vortex is more expensive than CC-vortex. In this case the former is no longer inducible by the latter, and one has the normal CC-vortex. It is very likely that the first possibility is always the case in cuprates. The argument is as follows. If the second possibility were true, there would be a zero-energy peak in the single-particle density of states in the vortex core of a BCS d-wave superconductor, which is actually never observed in cuprates. [15] This absence is however compatible with the capturing of spin moment around the vortex, making it non-topological. The existence of local spin moment and the removal of super current (caused by

phase winding) are detrimental to the zero energy single particle state.

The underlying softened incommensurate anti-ferromagnetic modes may be related to the checker board pattern observed in the local density of states around vortices in cuprates.[16] The period of $4a$ in the modulation may be a result of commensurability pinned by the underlying lattice.

2) The dynamic spin fluctuations are gapped. For the transverse b -photon, the energy gap is given by $w_b \sim \sqrt{K_m(K_v + K_c)} \sim 1/\lambda_b \sim 1/\lambda_L$ (assuming $K_v \sim K_c$), tracing the superfluid density $1/\lambda_L^2$. In view of our starting spin magnetic ordering vector $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}_0(1 - x)$ for cuprates this is just the incommensurate inelastic neutron resonance observed in cuprates.[5] When the b -photon wave-length decreases so that the spin excitations are closer to the vector $\mathbf{Q}_0$, the gap increases. These results explain the existence of a $\mathbf{Q}_0$ resonance at higher energy.[5] The academic importance of the fact that the neutron resonance energy traces the superfluid density can never be over-estimated: The superfluid density is the quantity describing the response of the superconductor to physical EM fields that is not of spin-origin in a usual BCS superconductor. The relation between neutron resonance and superfluid density therefore implies a breathtaking effect: the superfluid response to spin excitations as if they were EM photons! This is just the consequence of the mutual-duality in the theory. In this sense, neutron resonance is just a fingerprint of a Mott superconductor, in the same way that the isotope effect is the fingerprint of phonon-driven weak-coupling BCS superconductors.

In the literature, there is a debate as whether the resonance is some collective mode that drives superconducting transition. The theory shows that it is merely a consequences rather than the cause.

3) By inspection of L in Eq.(6) we find that assuming absence of long-range forces between CC-charges and between M'C charges, the massless phase modes in the CC and M'C, combining with the gauge field b , couples to the CC and M'C 3-currents. This is where one can do re-fermionization by expressing these currents in terms of Dirac fermions. The theory for such fermions has to assume the form of a QED₃ theory by Lorenz invariance and gauge invariance. This is indeed found as a property of nodal quasi-particles in d-wave superconductors coupled to fluctuating vortices.[17] Our theory gives physical meaning to the b -gauge field. While our theory starts off Mott insulator limit on microscopic grounds, the QED₃ starts off a phenomenological description of quasi-particles interacting with vortices in d-wave superconductor. At zero doping our theory describes quantum antiferromagnetism while QED₃ arrives at the same place via chiral symmetry breaking of the field theory combined

with hand-made parameters to cope with the Mott insulator limit. Under these contexts they address the same physics from different paths that all lead to a place called Rome. The existence of low lying fermion excitations is important to understand the well-behaved quasi-particle scattering interference from weak impurities,[2] in that in the absence of vortices in both CC and M'C, the effective theory is very much the same as that of a usual BCS superconductor as viewed in the CC sector alone. The implication is that local density of states (LDOS) modulation around weak impurities observed by scanning tunnelling microscopy[2] are the effect of scattering interference of the low-lying quasi-particle states as if in usual d-wave BCS theory, but the LDOS modulation found around vortices [16] finds another likely mechanism in our theory, i.e., via capturing of quantized spin moments and softening of incommensurate anti-ferromagnetic fluctuations.

I thank Z. Tesanovic for communications. This work is supported by NSFC 10204011 and 10021001.

-
- [1] Some essential phenomenology was summarized in, *e.g.*, J. Orenstein and A. J. Millis, *Science* **288**, 468 (2000).
 - [2] J. E. Hoffman, *et al*, *Science* **297**, 1148 (2002); K. McElroy, *et al*, *Nature* **422**, 592 (2003).
 - [3] Qiang-Hua Wang and Dung-Hai Lee, *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 020511 (2003); D. Zhang and C. S. Ting, *cond-mat/0209318*; J. M. Byers, M. E. Flatte, and D. J. Scalapino, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 3363 (1993).
 - [4] H. Ding, *et al*, *Phys. Rev. B* **54**, R9678 (1996); Z. X. Shen, *et al*, *Science* **267**, 343 (1995).
 - [5] H. A. Mook, *et al*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 3490 (1993); P. Dai, *et al*, *ibid* **77**, 5425; K. Yamada *et al*, *Phys. Rev. B* **57**, 6165 (1997).
 - [6] A. J. Millis, *et al*, *J. Phys. Chem. Solids* **59**, 1724 (1998).
 - [7] Dung-Hai Lee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 2694 (2000).
 - [8] Qiang-Hua Wang, *cond-mat/0306395*.
 - [9] Z. Y. Weng, D. N. Sheng, Y.-C.Chen, and C.S. Ting, *Phys. Rev. B* **55** 3894 (1997); Su-Peng Kou and Zheng-Yu Weng, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 157003 (2003).
 - [10] The concept of duality and useful techniques in another context can be found in, *e.g.*, Dung-Hai Lee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 227003 (2002).
 - [11] S.-C. Zhang, *Science* **275**, 1089 (1997).
 - [12] B. Nachumi, *et al*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 5421 (1996); T. Adachi, *et al*, *cond-mat/0306233*.
 - [13] Patrick A. Lee, *cond-mat/0210113*.
 - [14] B. Lake, *et al*, *Science* **291**, 1759 (2001); *Nature* **415**, 299 (2002).
 - [15] I. Maggio-Aprile, *et al*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 2754 (1995); V. F. Mitrovic, *et al*, *Nature* **413**, 6855 (2001).
 - [16] J. E. Hoffman, *et al*, *Science* **295**, 466 (2002).
 - [17] I. F. Herbut, *Phys. Rev. B* **66**, 094504 (2002); M. Franz, Z. Tesanovic, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 257003 (2001); *ibid* **87**, 257003 (2001).